

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

DAVID LESTER GROHOSKE #1838849       §  
v.   §       CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:15cv486  
BRAD LIVINGSTON, ET AL.                   §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff David Grohoske, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the case be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

After reviewing the pleadings, the magistrate judge recommended that Grohoske's lawsuit be dismissed for failure to prosecute or to obey an order of the Court in that Grohoske did not furnish a certified TDCJ inmate trust account data sheet, as required by 28 U.S.C. §1915(b), despite being ordered to do so. Grohoske received a copy of the magistrate judge's report on or before March 17, 2016, but filed no objections thereto; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the record in this cause and the report of the magistrate judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the report of the magistrate judge is correct. See United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989)


(where no objections to a magistrate judge's report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law."). It is accordingly

**ORDERED** that the report of the magistrate judge (docket no. 14) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to prosecute or to obey an order of the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). It is further

**ORDERED** that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby **DENIED**.

**SIGNED this 20th day of April, 2016.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE